

Enrico dal Lago and Constantina Katsari (eds.), *Slave Systems: Ancient and Modern*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008. 375 pp. ISBN 978-0-521-88183-8.

The subject of this collection of essays is the relation between comparative history and the ways in which slavery is conceptualized by historians. The book presents the proceedings of an international conference on the same subject held at the Moore Institute for Research in the Humanities and Social Studies, National University of Ireland, Galway, in 2004. The question of slavery has been dealt with in modern scholarship using a comparative approach by historians, sociologists and anthropologists alike. The current volume offers the most comprehensive analysis of comparative history on the subject of slavery.

This publication provides complex and elaborated answers to such questions as what is a comparative historical study of slavery, what kinds of different approaches does it encompass, and is the comparative approach fruitful for our understanding of the institution of slavery. The book contains eleven articles divided into five parts. Part I, 'Slavery, slave systems, world history, and comparative history', deals with general questions concerning the relation between comparative history and the study of slavery. Part II, 'Economics and technology of ancient and modern slave systems', presents new reflections on the economic definition of the institution of slavery. Part III, 'Ideologies and practices of management in ancient and modern slavery', considers the intellectual frameworks that supported the existence of this institution. Part IV, 'Existing slave systems' explores the elasticity of the institution of slavery by focusing on the different conditions that enable the slave's emancipation. Part V, 'Slavery and unfree labour, ancient and modern', contains a single article which deals with comparative economic history.

The volume exhibits the different methodologies utilized by comparativist historians and the manner in which they relate to the definition of slavery as a historical/social phenomenon. To illustrate this point, I will summarize below the different essays not according to the division of the editors, but rather according to the comparative methodologies that they present. Most, but not all, of the articles present a diachronic comparative approach. Moreover, there are two types of criteria according to which slavery systems are compared: internal criteria, i.e. points of comparison that are taken within the systems themselves; and external criteria, i.e. points of comparison that connect the slave system to its historical environment. Dividing my analysis into four types of comparative strategies, I outline this difference in order to understand in what ways each type of comparison can be productive for the study of a historical phenomenon such as slavery.

1. Diachronic comparison using internal criteria

In his article 'Slavery, gender, and work in the pre-modern world and early Greece: a cross-cultural analysis' (32-69), Orlando Patterson presents a structural analysis of labour organization in 186 pre-modern tribal and small-scale communities as they were studied by George Peter Murdock and Douglas White (1969). Patterson tackles the relations between the economic use of slaves and the place of women in the family's social and economic structures. He studies the differences and similarities between micro-economies in their social structures. His comparative method enables him to present a sociological structural model based on a common mechanism of socio-economic organization. He concludes that where polygamy is the norm, there will be a negative ratio between slavery and the participation of women in production due to the difference in status between men and women.

Walter Scheidel's article, 'The comparative economics of slavery in the Greco-Roman world' (105-126), builds a socio-economic model of a spectrum with 'open' and 'closed' slave societies at its opposite poles. This is analyzed according to the integration of the manumitted slave in the social structure (following J.L. Watson, 1980). A society in which the freed slave is incorporated into the owners' families would be defined an 'open' slave system, while a society in which the

manumitted slave remains excluded would be defined as 'closed'. Scheidel uses this model in order to explain the success of chattel slavery in ancient Greece and Rome. He points to a correlation between the relative degree of 'openness' of the slave system and 'thinness' of the labour market, and concludes that chattel slavery characterizes 'closed' societies in which the labour market is 'thin', i.e. where there are fewer possibilities to acquire non-slave labour forces. Akin to Patterson's approach, this study relies on a comparison of 'internal' elements of different societies in order to reach a common socioeconomic reasoning to explain the existence of different types of slavery.

Another diachronic comparison based on internal criteria is presented in the editors' article, 'Ideal models of slave management in the Roman world and in the ante-bellum American South' (187-213), in which they compare the ancient Roman and modern American systems of slave management. The analysis of each system is based on the internal criteria of that system, and reveals the ideal models of slave-master relationship as developed in each of the two societies in question.

In all three essays, the societies compared have no relation one with the other. They were taken as case-studies as a way of comparing not only the internal socioeconomic, but also the intellectual frameworks that supported slave systems. Such a comparative strategy is conditioned by a perception of slavery as part of a closed socioeconomic-mental environment. It ignores, however, the external elements that influence the development of slavery and support slave systems. This becomes apparent in the second type of diachronic comparison, which is based on external differences and similarities.

2. Diachronic comparison using external criteria

Joseph C. Miller, 'Slaving as historical process: examples from the ancient Mediterranean and the modern Atlantic' (70-102), compares American Atlantic slavery to other forms of slavery and looks at the ways in which slavery was practiced in historical circumstances of confrontation. The mobility of the slave population provides a challenge of social integration that generated a change of power without any meaningful social transformation. Analyzing the historical context of American slavery, however, Miller argues that it does not fit the model, since American slavery did not correspond to the new rising national identity and was not utilized to engender structural change in society. It is the external criteria, the cross comparison between different slavery systems, that enables him to outline the particularity of the ante-bellum American slavery.

In another article, 'Slavery and technology in pre-industrial contexts' (127-147), Tracey Rihll employs external criteria in order to examine the manner in which slaves could be considered as a means of technological change. Here, the study of slavery as a form of cross-cultural and cross-social mobility, i.e. using criteria that extend the micro-economic organization, underscores the vital connections between physical and cultural kinds of mobility. In both articles, the authors contextualize the place of slavery in society by external references. In contrast to the diachronic comparison according to internal criteria, their methodological approach considers slavery as part of a larger historical process. However, such a comparison does not allow the historian to detect a common social mechanism in slave societies. It is here that diachronic comparison according to both internal and external criteria proves particular useful.

3. Diachronic comparison using both internal and external criteria

In his article, 'Processes of exiting slave systems: a typology' (233-264), Olivier Pétré-Grenouilleau uses a comparative approach to study two different forms of exit from slavery: the one which keeps the emancipated slave closer to his former master, the other which causes rupture in the relation between slave and master. The comparison is made by considering both internal and external criteria in relation to different forms of exiting slavery such as enfranchisement,

revolt, running away, and abolition. To examine whether such exit ways from slavery preserve or transform the slave system, the internal criteria provide the only way to analyze the mechanism of the internal structure of a slave system. However, Pétrel-Grenouilleau's objective is to understand the particularity of the abolitionist movement. In other words, his objective is not to find a structural model of "behaviour" for every slave system, but to comprehend the differences in mechanism of behaviour. The historical context of each of the systems studied is therefore analyzed against its historical "environment".

The same approach is also taken by Stanley Engerman's, 'Emancipation schemes: different ways of ending slavery' (265-282), and Stephen Hodkinson's 'Spartiates, helots and the direction of the agrarian economy: toward an understanding of helotage in comparative perspective' (285-320). The first examines the different processes of emancipation in modern societies of the Americas in the nineteenth century, while the second presents a comparative study of unfree labour in different societies as a way of exploring the particularity of the helotic system in Sparta. The diachronic comparative approach manages to shed important light on the specificities of a system because it uses both internal and external criteria of comparison. The first reveals both the common and different unique features of each slave/unfree labour society, while the second enables the similarities and differences of slave systems to be appreciated not only on the basis of the internal structure, but also as part of larger historical processes.

4. Synchronic comparison based on internal and external criteria

Looking for internal or external reasoning for particular behaviour of a slave system or the exit from it, the three types of the diachronic comparative approaches disregard the historical evolution of a slave system. It is here that the synchronic comparison proves to be extremely fruitful as is demonstrated in the two excellent articles by Michael Zeuske, 'Comparing or interlinking? Economic comparison of early nineteenth-century slave systems in the Americas in historical perspective' (148-183), and Rafael de Bivar Marquese and Fábio Duarte Joly, 'Panis, disciplina, et opus servo: the Jesuit ideology in Portuguese America and Greco-Roman ideas of slavery' (214-230).

Zeuske presents a synchronic and comparative historical study of the development in the thought and practice of slavery in three Caribbean slave societies. Slavery appears here as a connective historical process that cannot be studied from a diachronic perspective alone. This productive approach deconstructs the notion of "an Atlantic slavery" and, concurrently, enables the author to criticize the method of diachronic comparison.

One of the obstacles in comparing two systems with the intention of coming up with a model of "behaviour" of a historical phenomenon, is the danger in using one slavery system as a point of reference to analyze another. The question is thus how the comparativist historian can liberate the histories he or she produces from this danger. Rafael de Bivar Marquese and Fábio Duarte Joly show the way in which the Portuguese Jesuits employed the study of classical slavery with the aim of reconciling it with the Christian attitude. This article is an exceptional contribution to this collection in revealing the ways in which the intellectual definition of slavery of a modern Atlantic slave system is connected to and conditioned by its ancient antecedents.

When approaching the study of slavery we always carry with us some preliminary images. The comparative approaches can either sustain such perspectives or question them. The synchronic comparative approach taken here by three scholars proves that a diachronic comparison of two unrelated historical contexts can prevent the perception of slavery as a flexible, adaptable and non-static process. References to medieval slavery could have been fruitful here in providing means to reveal the evolution of slave systems, yet this was not the objective of the participants. This volume elucidates the ways in which slavery is approached, analyzed and understood today. It is an invaluable contribution to scholars wishing to question and define their own approach to

the study of slavery. As Olivier Pétré-Grenouilleau puts it: ‘comparative typology may be useful as a heuristic tool, not as an objective in itself’ (233, book under review).

Youval Rotman

Yale University

Rudolf Haensch and Johannes Heinrichs (eds.), *Herrschen und Verwalten. Der Alltag der römischen Administration in der Hohen Kaiserzeit*, Kölner historische Abhandlungen 46, Köln: Böhlau, 2007, 466 pp. ISBN-10: 3412238066; ISBN-13: 978-3412238063.

Eine Festschrift zu rezensieren ist im Allgemeinen eine undankbare Aufgabe. Handelt es sich bei dem (im vorliegenden Titel nicht genannten) Geehrten um einen — zurecht — international bekannten Historiker wie Werner Eck, wird die Sache doppelt peinlich. Allein die Tatsache, dass der Rezensent mit dem berühmten Mann seit fast 50 Jahren befreundet ist und selbst den wissenschaftlichen *cursus honorum* längst hinter sich hat, machte es möglich, diese Aufgabe zu übernehmen.

Der Band umfasst die teilweise leicht überarbeiteten Vorträge eines Colloquiums, das Anfang 2005 vom Institut für Altertumskunde der Universität Köln zum 65. Geburtstag Werner Ecks, seines langjährigen Professors für Alte Geschichte und Vorstandes veranstaltet worden war. Die Vorträge spiegeln recht gut die Forschungsinteressen Ecks wieder: römische Inschriften, Prosopographie und die Verwaltung der Roms, Italiens und der Provinzen in der Kaiserzeit. Inschriften, meist Ehren- oder Grabinschriften, sind deshalb die Hauptquellen für jeden, der sich mit dem Funktionieren des Imperium Romanum beschäftigt, weil für römische Historiker dies kein Thema war — ihr Publikum kannte diese Vorgänge nur zu gut und interessierte sich eher für Senatoren, die Krieg führten oder die beim Hof in Ungnade gefallen waren. Prosopographie, die Zusammenstellung der — meist epigraphischen — Daten für die Laufbahnen von Senatoren und Rittern in der Kaiserzeit, lässt aus diesen die Reihenfolge und Wertigkeit der einzelnen Ämter erkennen. Doch nicht nur diese beiden Stände waren, wie schon seit der Republik, mit Herrschaft und Verwaltung beschäftigt. Unter und neben ihnen bildete sich seit Augustus aus der privaten Dienerschaft des Kaiserhauses ein administratives Personal heraus, das zunächst die Einkünfte aus den Domänen, Minen, Steinbrüchen usw. verwaltete, bald aber auch für die ‘staatlichen’ Finanzen eingesetzt wurde. Hier entstand eine hierarchisch geordnete Bürokratie aus Sklaven und Freigelassenen, die uns dann in den juristischen Quellen des 4. Jhdts wieder begegnet. In den Provinzen stand so neben dem freien Mitarbeiterstab des Statthalters, der sich fast ausschließlich aus dem Militär rekrutierte, der unfreie und freigelassene Apparat des Prokurators, der dem freien an Zahl kaum nachgestanden haben dürfte: der Sklave Musicus Scurranus, Kassenverwalter beim *fiscus* der Provinz Lugudunensis, wurde unter Tiberius von 16 seiner Untersklaven (*vicarii*) in Rom bestattet (*ILS* 1514).

Mehrere der Beiträge des Bandes behandeln diesen Bereich: S. Panciera (60-79) stellt unter dem Titel ‘Servire a Palazzo’ eine Reihe von unveröffentlichten Grabinschriften aus Rom vor, die Mitgliedern der Palastverwaltung gesetzt wurden, Sekretären und Briefboten, Kammerdienern und Ärzten, aber auch mit so schönen Titeln wie *adiutor a commentariis rationis voluptatum*: die bürokratische Verwaltung der *voluptas*. Die militärische Verwaltung in den Provinzen, die in den letzten Jahren besser bekannt wurde durch Archive wie das der 9. Bataverkohorte in Vindolanda/Britannien, das eines Militärpostens am Rand der Wüste in Bu Njem und eines anderen in den Marmorbergwerken in Ägypten, erörtert A.R. Birley (306-324) am Beispiel einiger der inzwischen berühmten Vindolanda Tablets. Überzeugend wird eine Inschrift aus dem italischen Fulginiae mit einigen Überlieferungsfetzen auf den tablets kombiniert, um so die frühe Laufbahn des Haterius Nepos zu erklären und um das Amt des *centurio regionarius* zu beleuchten. S. Demougin (271-288) schildert den administrativen Alltag (‘au quotidien’) der